

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended without prejudice.

The Office objected to claims 1-20 because in claim 1 the term –within – or a suitable substitute, should be inserted after “disposed.” Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Office.

The Office rejected claims 1-5, 8-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vercaemer et al. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome Vercaemer by limiting claim 1 to a drill pipe with transition regions with a locking surface located in pin and box ends. Vercaemer does not disclose a conformable metal tube in a drill pipe with a pin and box end, but discloses a conformable metal tube in a bore hole. Since the bore hole is structurally different than the claimed drill pipe, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Vercaemer. Further the Applicants also respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not obvious in light of Vercaemer either since Vercaemer does not disclose a locking in the pin and box ends of a drill. Since claims 2-5, 8-17, and 19 depend from now allowable base claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5, 8-17, and 19 are now also allowable.

The Office also rejected claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koster. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome Koster by limiting claim 1 to a drill pipe with transition regions with a locking surface located in pin and box ends. Koster does not disclose a conformable metal tube in a drill pipe with a pin and box end, but discloses a method for lining downhole casing, pipelines, and gas mains and is silent about the transition regions in box and pin ends of drill pipe. Koster discloses a lining material “having sufficient resiliency to uncoil” and lock itself in position within a bore (see column 1, lines 62-68), since a key feature of the present claimed invention is

the transition region with the locking surface, and Koster is silent about transition regions or locking surfaces and discloses a different structure for locking the tube in place, the Applicants believe that Koster does not anticipate now amended claim 1. Since claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, and 17 depend from now allowable base claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, and 17 are also now allowable.

The Office rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dines et al. Again, claim 1 has been amended to overcome Dines. Dines does not disclose a conformable metal tube which terminates in the pin and box ends of a drill pipe with transition regions comprising a locking surface, but Dines discloses a nipple for extending through a subsurface fluid production zone. Dines does not teach or suggest that transition regions on the inside of a drill pipe and located in pin and box ends of the drill pipe lock a conformable metal tube in position. Nor does Dines teach or suggest a conformable metal tube which terminates adjacent a pin and box end of a drill pipe. In light of the amendment to claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now allowable over Dines. Since claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, 19 and 20 all depend from now allowable base claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, 19 and 20 are now also allowable.

The Office rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (2003/0178197). Claim 1 has been amended to overcome Smith. Smith does not disclose a conformable metal tube which terminates in the pin and box ends of a drill pipe with transition regions comprising locking surfaces. Smith does however teach joining different tubular strings together. Since Smith does not disclose a conformable metal tube in a single drill pipe with the ends of the tube terminating in both the box and pin ends of the same drill pipe, the claimed invention is not anticipated by Smith. Further, since the Smith does not teach that the metal tube is held in place by the transition

regions of the inside surface of a single drill pipe, the claimed invention is further differentiated from Smith. Since claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 17 and 18 depend from now allowable base claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 17 and 18 are also now allowable.

The Office rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dines et al., Smith et al., or Koster in view of Hiraide et al. Since claim 7 depends from now allowable base claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is now allowable.

In view of the arguments and amendments made herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe that there are no fees due at this time and also appreciate the thorough review made by the Office. If there are any questions concerning the above, please contact the undersigned at 801-310-8427.

Respectfully submitted,

/Tyson J. Wilde/

Electronically signed by Tyson J. Wilde on September 25, 2006

Reg. No. 57,012

Novatek International, Inc.
2185 South Larsen Parkway
Provo Utah 84606

Ph: 801-310-8427

Fax: 1-888-453-1436

e-mail: twilde@novatekonline.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or by facsimile or electronic transmission to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

9-25-06

Date

/Tyson J. Wilde/

Signature